## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,234	11/19/2001	William S. Nevin	NEVIN-0001	8116
21261 ROBERT PLA	90 03/23/2007 CRELL		EXAMINER	
REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY		COBANOGLU, DILEK B		
P.O. BOX 1310 JEKYLL ISLA	65 ND, GA 31527		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		3626		
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/988,234	NEVIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dilek B. Cobanoglu	3626	

	Bilon B. Cobarrogia	1 0020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 March 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance.	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 CF	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
time periods:  a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	•	in the final rejection, whi	ichover is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	•	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply oric r than three months after the mailing d	of the fee. The appropri ginally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
	Nignon with 27 CED 44 27 must be	filed within two months	a af tha data af
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t	o avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	f will not be entered be	ecause
(a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further co			00000
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		, ,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	• •	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See continuation sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11	•	•	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment (	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		,	,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>rione</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-26</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .		-	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attach	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See continuation sheet.</u></li> </ol>	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.	$\Lambda$	Hayes W. HAYES	
	John	~/\"/	
·	JOHN	W. HAYES	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)** 

Application No.

Continuation of 3: As claim 1 has been amended, a new matter is added to the claim: "each customized medical report being provided in a predetermined format for a corresponding one of the patient, the attending physician, and the insurance provider".

Continuation of 11: Applicant argues that Mohlenbrock does not teach generating a Health Summary Record, Examiner respectfully submits that Joao teaches generating a diagnostic (or medical) report in abstract, col. 16, lines 38-65, col. 25, lines 25-53 and col. 25, line 63 to col. 26, line 6, Examiner combined Joao and Mohlenbrock, because Mohlenbrock teaches standardized codes in col. 5, lines 14-35. And the motivation for this combination is "necessary data readily available in the form to be directly used in making an estimate" (Mohlenbrock; col. 4, lines 3-14).

Applicant argues that with regard to claims 4, 17, 5 and 18, Joao does not teach "custom medical reports for the physician and the patient"; Examiner respectfully submits that none of these claims recite "custom medical reports for the physician and the patient"; claims 4, 17, 5 and 18 all recite "customized medical report generated for the attending pyhsician includes the medical recommendation program".

Applicant argues that with regard to claims 6 and 19, Joao does not teach "educational materials to the patient"; Examiner respectfully submits that claims 6 and 19 recite "educational program for the patient", and Joao teaches "the database 10H contains data regarding helathcare news, developments, discoveries, etc., which can be utilized for training of healthcare professionals as well as for providing general information to any user of the present invention", and Joao also teaches that "the present invention can be utilized by any provider, patient for educational purposes" (Joao; col. 29, lines 4-15).

Applicant argues that with regard to claims 9, 11, 12, 13, 24, 25 and 26, Joao does not teach "generating custom reports for both doctors and patients based upon the Health Summary Record"; Examiner respectfully submits that none of these claims recite this limitation.